

From: Bryan Thompson  
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 4:36 PM  
Subject: vote against consolidation

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20554

Sample FCC Email, Letter or Comment. Also can be used for Congress.

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Bryan Thompson

709 Hitchcock, Lisle, IL

60532

(630) 969-6424

**From:** Walt Dennig  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 15, 2003 5:21 PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Walt Dennig (wrdennig@pacbell.net) writes:

I'm interested in the upcoming panel discussion in re: Media Ownership to be held in San Francisco in late April. Can you please provide me with time and location?

Additionally, can you point me to the part of the FCC website that will contain the latest information on this panel?

Thank you, Walt

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 63.197.70.73  
Remote IP address: 63.197.70.73

**From:** Beki  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Tue, Apr 15, 2003 10:55 PM  
**Subject:** The Airwaves Belong to the People

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. **YOU DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO LIMIT THE PEOPLES AIRWAVE. YOU ARE TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE, THE PUBLIC INTEREST, NOT THE CORPORATIONS, OR THOSE WHO HAVE DEEP POCKETS.**

In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised. **THIS HAS ALREADY OCCURRED.**

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding. **IN FACT, YOU SHOULD DECREASE THE MONOPOLIES AND INCREASE LIMITATIONS ON OWNERSHIP.**

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA, I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest. **YOU ARE NOT SERVING THE PUBLIC WHEN YOU LIMIT PARTICIPATION - YOU KNOW WHO YOU ARE SERVING.**

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.



**From:** hapi22aearthlink.net  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 11:25 AM  
**Subject:** DO NOT FAIL the American people

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections.

The media companies have FAILED in their public trust to provide crucial UNBIASED information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to

- \* break up the media conglomerates,
- \* open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists
- \* reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

The American airwaves belong to the American people and are to be operated on behalf of the American public's well-being. The American airwaves are not a trough at which wealthy political campaign contributors may feed.

I hope you will protect the American people's right to have access to as varied an assortment of opinions on public issues as is possible. To do anything less would be un-American.

Please DO NOT FAIL the American people in order to please wealthy, ideologically driven media owners. Please.

Thank you,  
:Lois Erwin

From: Vega, Felice M  
To: Commissioner Adelstein  
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 2:16 PM  
Subject: Deregulation Vote

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

FELICE M. VEGA  
San Francisco, CA

From: Maris Moon  
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell  
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 4:15 PM  
Subject: Deregulation of broadcasting ownership

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.

Amy M. Mundie

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

**From:** Webber. Dana  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 6:39 PM  
**Subject:** Why rule changes are a bad idea

Thank you for speaking out on the issue of media concentration. I hope your good work pays off!

April 17, 2003

Commissioner Michael J. Copps  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Mr. Copps:

Thank you for your efforts to bring in consumer voices on the proposed changes to FCC rules for media. I would've attended hearings on the subject had I **known** of them. **So** now I 'm writing about how the issue of media concentration looks to ordinary viewers like me.

#### Why Proposed Rule Changes Are a Bad Idea

I can't see any public interest argument **at all** to be made for changing the current FCC media concentration protections. To the extent that we have at least some "localism, diversity and competition" in the media now is testament to the success of these rules over the past **25** years. There is currently a measure of independent ownership of media outlets. Why scrap the rules that created it? Especially since the only precedent we have for what will happen is the radio industry. If mass appeal music, a dearth of creative new local artists, less coverage of public affairs and the proliferation of national talk radio personalities all with the same style and no substance is the result of relaxing the FCC rules, what makes **us** think the other media outlets will be any different? Why take this risk?

**~~Why~~ what isn't broken?**

#### Two Likely Consequences of Rule Changes

**~~The prevalence of even coarser programming than currently exists.~~** Why? It's no secret that advertisers exert more and more influence on programming to attract a younger audience, the **so-**called lucrative younger demographic. What lures young people, in Madison Avenue's view, is sex, violence and raw language. Programming would be different with local owners and local advertisers having a say about what programs are carried and how much sex or violence is portrayed on them. Consolidation will make media decision makers less responsive to community standards and needs.

**~~Loss of autonomy and integrity in journalism~~** When the Enron scandal came out I fully expected the media to **fulfill** its important watchdog role. Where **are** the investigations into the factors that allowed Enron (and so many others) to bilk taxpayers, employees and consumers of billions of dollars? Why has the coverage of that scandal and other corporate scandals been so superficial? As a citizen (and an investor) I think these issues should have at least the amount of coverage as the latest kidnapping or celebrity murder. More to the current point, why is it that the proposed changes your commission is considering have had next to no air time on any of the broadcast stations you regulate? I realize the FCC can't mandate unbiased, objective reporting by the corporate media on issues that affect their bottom line. But at least you can take a stand to prevent the situation from deteriorating further.

### The Internet is **No** Solution

It's been said that the Internet gives people access to alternative sources of information and news. But let's be real about it. Poor and many working class people can't afford Internet services. Additionally, independent Internet websites can't possibly compete with the sites operated by the media conglomerates. They can't afford to provide the glitzy formats, video streaming and continually refreshed content you'd have to have to compete with a CNN.com. And why should I have to do an internet search to verify media accuracy and get a diversity of viewpoints on issues?

Media lobbyists no doubt argue that they will re-invest profits from consolidating to provide higher quality programming. Why should we believe that? TV is quite capable of providing higher quality programming **now**. Despite bad business decisions on their part, media enterprises are still quite profitable, profitable enough to hire scriptwriters to create decent programs. ~~Yet~~ they opt for cheap and crass — reality programming.

**I am** not a lawyer. It's said that pressure has been coming from the courts to justify sustaining the current rules. If that is **so**, an FCC lawyer could make **a** very strong case based on the unique nature of the service that the media provides. Surely the courts will make **a** distinction between corporate concentration in the auto or home improvement industries — and control of the major media in just a few hands. One can still have a democracy even with monopolies in major goods and services. Without free press there is no such thing as a true democracy.

I urge you to take a stand against rules that would allow further media concentration and cross acquisition. Broadcasting is simply too important to the functioning of democracy for decisions to be left to a handful of broadcasters.

Sincerely,

Dana Webber  
Nine Brown Street  
Melrose, Massachusetts **02176**

**From:** jtczech@bellatlantic.net  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 7:55 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that **use** local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission **see** the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not **less**, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

James Czech  
24 Kile Drive  
Scotia, New York 12302-5729

From: Rose, Michael G  
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps. 'govmpowell@fcc.gov'  
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:17 PM  
Subject: Deregulation Vote June 2

FCC Commissioner:

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you,

---

Michael G. Rose

---

From: ct56@juno.com  
To: Michael Copps  
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:22 PM  
Subject: Deregulation

I believe that the first duty of the FCC is to see that the public is protected from monopolies.

I understand that the Commission is now considering proposals which were submitted by SBC and Verizon. These proposals are tantamount to deregulating these two companies. Both companies are monopolies and are under the control of the California Public Utilities Commission. Deregulation has its place however but take a look what deregulation did to the Electric Utilities. These new regulations are passed without strong oversight we headed for a with phone monopolies again and I will pay more because of it.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to take strong action to see that the public is protected.

Sincerely,

Charles Traut

From: ct56@juno.com  
To: Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:22 PM  
Subject: De Regulation

I believe that the first duty of the FCC is to see that the public is protected from monopolies.

I understand that the Commission is now considering proposals which were submitted by SBC and Verizon. These proposals are tantamount to deregulating these two companies. Both companies are monopolies and are under the control of the California Public Utilities Commission. Deregulation has its place however jut take a look what deregulation did to the Electric Utilities. These new regulations are passed without strong oversight we headed for a with phone monopolies again and I will paying more be cause of it.

I hope that you will give serious consideration to take strong action to see that the public is protected.

Sincerely,

Charles Traut

**From:** Susan Mullins  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:42 PM  
**Subject:** FW: media conglomeration

I know that you have been instrumental in trying to prevent deregulation of the FCC, since I followed the Columbia U debate on WBAI. Thank **You** Sincerely, and keep up the good work! This was sent to **all** the commissioners. :-) Susan Mullins

From: Susan Mullins <mullsr@earthlink.net>  
Date: Thu. 17 Apr 2003 15:32:11 -0400  
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>  
Subject: media conglomeration

We feel we must vociferously protest the media conglomeration in this country and would like to share with you the views we have sent on to the TV companies! We also want the break-up of the companies that are in existence; if all they can provide the "cleaned up", "state" messages they have heretofore been providing.

"We feel the kind of news coverage coming from the TV and the "slant" of its shows has failed the American public, abysmally.

I read about the results of agent orange on Vietnam War Vets' children in April, 2001; when I was going through chemotherapy. This was easy to connect since my father was a chemist at Diamond Alkalai in Newark in **1945** - manufacturing agent orange! Within a very short time, all the members of his division were dead from cancer. His children before **1945** are fine, but I was born after.

To not tell Americans of the after effects of depleted uranium on both Iraqis and THEIR OWN CHILDREN, is criminal. We have not been able to stomach or tolerate your news casts. Please share the dark side of what we are doing. It is truly your duty to your countrymen and YOUR OWN LIVES! The current statistics are **4.5** out of **10** Americans can expect to have to deal with cancer in their lifetime.

Why is the money we are spending not considered? We are "begging" ourselves into what that truly infamous spokesman, Michael Savage, calls "turd world nation status! How does it happen that Halliburton gets \$7 BILLION for stopping fires in Iraq (fires that are already "capped"! when some area of the country are going to 4 day school weeks to save 20% on teachers' salaries? Why are library hours being drastically reduced, yet we have money for DynCorp to go into Iraq with "questionable" operations? The TV should be reporting on these matters!

Please do not make the TV a curious artifact in our home. Return it to a source of information and entertainment we can respect. It would **be** the most "patriotic" thing you could do if the truth were told!"

Sincerely,  
Susan Mullins  
Richard Mullins

**From:** KRyder8633@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu. Apr 17, 2003 8:52 PM  
**Subject:** Change in FCC rules

Please do not vote for any change in rules that would allow the various media of this country to come under the ownership of one company in any particular area. This would be a dangerous assault on our choice of information sources and our ability of as a people to become informed on a variety of perspectives on any particular issue. Thank you

From: K Ryder8633@aol.com  
To: Michael Copps  
Date: Thu, Apr 17, 2003 8:53 PM  
Subject: Change in FCC rules

Please do not vote for any change in rules that would allow the various media of this country to come under the ownership of one company in any particular area. This would be a dangerous assault on our choice of information sources and our ability of as a people to become informed on a variety of perspectives on any particular issue. Thank you.

**From:** xknowlesx@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 18, 2003 12:10 AM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

thomas costello  
9798 schlagel st.  
longmont, Colorado 80503

From: James Embree  
To: Kathleen Abernathy  
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 12:51 PM  
Subject: Ownership Rules

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

As a consumer of media in various forms, newspaper, TV, radio, etc., I am following with interest your pursuit of rule changes concerning ownership of TV and newspapers in the same market. Recent articles suggest publishers and others who own both newspapers and TV stations are making the case that because there are so many more choices for consumers now, ie satellite, cable etc. that the rules should be relaxed.

I would tend to agree if not for the fact that broadcasters (NAB) fight tooth and nail to bar the delivery of distant network signals by capable distribution channels (satellite). If I am only allowed local channels, what extra choice do I have? Should the same company own a TV station, newspaper and web site or radio station in the same market, even with all the various delivery choices I may have, my overall choice will be reduced.

Should you decide to relax cross-ownership rules, I strongly suggest you also consider relaxing rules related to distant network availability, particularly as it relates to satellite, and allow consumers real choice instead of consolidation of editorial and marketing strength.

Sincerely,

James Embree

James Embree  
Las Vegas, Nevada

From: James Embree  
To: Michael Copps  
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 12:52 PM  
Subject: Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Copps:

As a consumer of media in various forms, newspaper, TV, radio, etc., I am following with interest your pursuit of rule changes concerning ownership of TV and newspapers in the same market. Recent articles suggest publishers and others who own both newspapers and TV stations are making the case that because there are so many more choices for consumers now, ie satellite, cable etc. that the rules should be relaxed.

I would tend to agree if not for the fact that broadcasters (NAB) fight tooth and nail to bar the delivery of distant network signals by capable distribution channels (satellite). If I am only allowed local channels, what extra choice do I have? Should the same company own a TV station, newspaper and web site or radio station in the same market, even with all the various delivery choices I may have, my overall choice will be reduced.

Should you decide to relax cross-ownership rules, I strongly suggest you also consider relaxing rules related to distant network availability, particularly as it relates to satellite, and allow consumers real choice instead of consolidation of editorial and marketing strength.

Sincerely,

James Embree

James Embree  
Las Vegas, Nevada

**From:** Betty Gibson aka Lady McBetty  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:39 PM  
**Subject:** Stop Deregulation of Media

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Respectfully,

Beverly L Gibson

Stanwood, MI 49346

Do you Yahoo!?  
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo

From: Beverly Gibson  
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner  
Adelstein  
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:43 PM  
Subject: Stop deregulation of Media Coverage

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Respectfully,

Beverly L Gibson

Stanwood, MI 49346

From: Dorothy Lavalle  
To: KM KJMWEEB, Michael Copps. Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner  
Adelstein  
Date: Fri, Apr 18.2003 1:48 PM  
Subject: Media ownership - Letter to the FCC

Concerning AP article, "FCC Head Won't Delay Media Ownership Vote" by David Ho

Dear FCC Chairman Michael Powell, Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner Michael J. Copps. Commissioner Kevin J. Martin, and Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

I am extremely concerned with the consolidation of the media into a very few corporate owners. Already the promises of the 1996 changes to regulations have not materialized. There is less competition, not more. I, for example, must accept the poor programming provided by Cox Communications, the only cable company in my area - in fact, another infomercial station was added since I wrote my letters of complaint and concern. The situation for many will only worsen if there are fewer alternatives. Then I read the April 16AP article by David Ho from which I quote:

The ownership rules include a ban on mergers between major television networks and a restriction preventing a company from owning a newspaper and a radio or television station in the same city. The rules also prohibit a company from owning TV stations that reach more than 35 percent of U.S. households. Powell repeatedly has said the rules should be changed. Two other Republicans on the five-member commission also are widely expected to seek looser regulations, an outcome sought by many large media companies who say the rules hurt business.

Critics warn that mergers resulting from looser rules could leave a few huge companies in control of what people watch, hear and read.

<http://storynews.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story2&cid=536&ncid=536&e=4&u=/ap/2003>

Already our media news is very poor. Only one position, the government's, is provided. I now get my news from BCC and C-Span for the most part, and I'd be poorly informed were it not for my computer. But many people get their only news from the major cable stations. Since we as citizens must be informed in order to make decisions within our democracy, this is a very sad situation for our nation. You have the responsibility to at least provide alternatives to the corporate media to which we now are subjected - at the very least by making policy that encourages a variety of news and entertainment sources. Our media now is an ocean of imbecility for the most part, and it's a shame for all segments of the population, but particularly for the children. It's little wonder our children have such poor test scores, and the general population have such poor geographic recognition. But perhaps more competition would encourage better quality productions. We, the people, own the airwaves, you administer in our names. It's my opinion that you have the responsibility to encourage broader media production and ownership, not less, for the sake of our local communities and the national welfare. We "liberals" do remain half the population and our concerns should be equally considered. Surely Republicans are also worried by a consolidation of ownership, you have that historic apprehension for good reason. Looser ownership rules we do not need, quite the opposite. We need to control the influence of the market and corporations who have an profit agenda, and little responsibility to the greater social needs of the society, it seems. Please keep to the schedule, and allow the American people to express their concerns in the period until June 2, which is their right. It's only fair, and fairness is the core of our legal system and social system.

Sincerely yours,  
Dorothy Lavalle